

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Accreditation Team Report**

**Institution:** California Lutheran University

**Dates of Visit:** February 28-March 4, 2009

**Accreditation Team  
Recommendation:** Accreditation

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards—

The joint NCATE/CTC team found that each of the Common Standards was met. This includes the additional sentences from the California Common Standards that are not addressed by the NCATE standards.

Program Standards –

All Program Standards in all programs were found to be met with the exception of Program Standard 8 Guidance, Assistance and Feedback, element (b) in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program. The element states “The support and assessment of each candidate is coordinated effectively between the candidate's supervising administrator(s), program supervisor(s) and the candidate.” There was no evidence that the current design of the program addressed this.

Overall Recommendation –

The team completed a thorough review of program documentation, evidence provided at the site, additional information provided by program administration and faculty, and interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, administrators, employers and other stakeholders. Based upon this review the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

**Initial/Teaching Credentials**

Multiple Subject  
Multiple Subject  
Multiple Subject Internships  
Multiple Subject BCLAD (Spanish)

**Advanced/Service Credentials**

Education Specialist Credentials  
Professional Level II  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Professional Level II

## **Initial/Teaching Credentials**

Single Subject  
Single Subject  
Single Subject Internships  
Single Subject BCLAD (Spanish)

## **Education Specialist Credentials**

### **Preliminary Level I**

Mild/Moderate Disabilities  
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities  
Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship  
Deaf and Hard of Hearing  
Deaf and Hard of Hearing Internship

## **Advanced/Service Credentials**

Deaf and Hard of Hearing

Reading Language Arts Certificate

## **Administrative Services**

Preliminary  
Professional

## **Pupil Personnel Services**

School Counseling  
Child Welfare and Attendance

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California Lutheran University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California Lutheran University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

## **Accreditation Team**

<b>NCATE Team Leader/Co-Chair:</b>	<b>John W. Rhodes</b> Friends University
<b>California Co-Chair:</b>	<b>Judith Maxwell Greig</b> Notre Dame de Namur University
<b>Common Standards Cluster:</b>	<b>Mark Cary</b> Principal, Davis Joint Unified School District, Retired  <b>Karen S. Godfrey</b> English Teacher, Seaman Unified School District  <b>Sam J. Hausfather</b> Maryville University of Saint Louis  <b>Michael Kotar</b> California State University, Chico  <b>Chukwunyere E. Okezie</b> Marygrove College
<b>Teaching Program Cluster:</b>	<b>Steve Turley</b> , Cluster Leader California State University, Long Beach  <b>Gwen Stowers</b> National University  <b>Marvilene Hagopian</b> Sacramento County Office of Education, Retired  <b>Pat Sheehan</b> Orange County Department of Education  <b>Beth Lasky</b> California State University, Northridge  <b>Janice Myck-Wayne</b> California State University, Fullerton
<b>Advanced/Services Programs Cluster:</b>	<b>Suzanne Power</b> , Cluster Leader Alliant International University  <b>Sandee Bonura</b> Chapman University College
<b>Staff to the Accreditation Team</b>	<b>Jo Birdsell</b> , Consultant  <b>Teri Clark</b> , Administrator

## Documents Reviewed

University Catalog  
Institutional Self Study  
Course Syllabi  
Candidate Files  
Fieldwork Handbooks  
Follow-up Survey Results  
Needs Analysis Results  
Field Experience Notebooks  
Service Learning Assignments  
Cooperating Teacher Handbook  
Supervisor Handbook

Contact History  
Program Planning Sheet  
Individual Program Assessment Data Summary  
Schedule of Classes  
Advisement Documents  
Faculty Vitae  
College Annual Report  
College Budget Plan  
Information Booklet  
Counseling Rating Form

## Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic/ Teaching Cluster	Advanced/ Services Cluster	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	5	24	41	23	<b>93</b>
Institutional Administration	4	10	19	6	<b>39</b>
Candidates	7	45	174	56	<b>282</b>
Graduates	2	3	60	17	<b>82</b>
Employers of Graduates	0	2	20	6	<b>28</b>
Supervising Practitioners	0	9	31	9	<b>49</b>
Advisors	0	0	7	9	<b>16</b>
School Administrators	0	2	18	6	<b>26</b>
Credential Analysts and Staff	0	5	2	1	<b>8</b>
Advisory Committee	0	0	20	1	<b>21</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>644</b>

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

## Background information

California Lutheran University (CLU) is one of 28 colleges and universities in the United States that are affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), the third largest Protestant Church body in the country. CLU is the only ELCA college or university founded since the First World War.

California Lutheran University was founded and continues to develop and grow. After two years of intensive planning and development, California Lutheran College first opened its doors to faculty and students in 1961. The institution is relatively young and continues to develop its character and identity.

A commitment to liberal undergraduate education in letters, arts, and sciences has always been central to the mission. From the beginning the institution was also committed to preparing academically and professionally competent educators. As its vision and mission expanded along with its physical plant and facilities, CLC became California Lutheran University in 1986. This transformation in both name and structure saw the creation of a College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business, School of Education, and the formalization of adult re-entry work into the highly successful Adult Degree Program (ADEP). This structure has enabled the University to provide the liberal undergraduate and pre-professional education envisioned by its founders and to respond to the social and occupational needs of its community.

California Lutheran University is a diverse scholarly community dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies. Rooted in the Lutheran tradition of the Christian faith, the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason. The mission of California Lutheran University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice.

The University currently offers baccalaureate degrees with 36 majors and 31 minors, in addition to professional preparation programs in specialized areas. Undergraduate enrollment consists of over 1600 traditional, full-time students representing 30 states and 19 countries and an additional 300 undergraduates who are enrolled in the Adult Degree Evening Program. CLU offers master's degrees and credential programs on campus and at off-campus centers in Ventura and Los Angeles Counties.

All graduate programs are designed to accommodate adults who are employed full time and pursuing coursework on a part-time basis. Each semester more than 1000 students are enrolled in credential and graduate programs in Business Administration, Computer Science, Education, Marital and Family Therapy, Psychology, and Public Policy and Administration. The School of Education enrolls more than half of these post-baccalaureate students each year.

Enrollment information noted in the Institutional Self Study Report for CLU are:

- Total Enrollment: 3499
- Undergraduate: 2196
- Graduate: 1303

### **Education Unit**

The unit is defined as the School of Education (SOE). The School of Education is one of two graduate/professional schools at CLU, the other being the School of Business. The SOE offers programs leading to credentials and masters degrees for elementary and secondary teachers; special educators, school counselors, school administrators, and reading/curriculum leaders. The SOE also offers Ed.D. programs for K-12 and higher education leaders.

Education Programs are offered on the main campus and at graduate centers at the following locations: Oxnard Campus, Woodland Hills Campus, Los Angeles Unified School District and Professional Development School Sites (Flory Academy of Sciences and Technology and Los Cerritos Middle School).

Although courses are offered at various locations, the program itself does not vary from one location to another. The same program and curriculum is offered at every location. The centers have been established primarily for candidate convenience and are located with easy freeway access. Full time faculty (and some part time faculty as well) drive to the various locations to teach, so that every student receives the same level and quality of instruction. WASC does not consider these programs to be off-campus programs due to their proximity to the main campus. Candidates themselves take often take classes at more than one location. Distance learning technologies are currently used only to supplement classroom-based instruction.

According to the Institutional Self Study Report, there are 22 full time faculty members: 15 tenure track professors and 6 non tenure track professors. Some of the non tenure track professors are former superintendents and retired faculty from other institutions. Faculty in the SOE participate actively in research and service both on and off campus

**Table 1**  
**Program Review Status**

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	Initial	59	CTC
Single Subject	Initial	68	CTC
Education Specialist M/M, M/S, Levels I & II including interns	Initial	70	CTC
Education Specialist DHH— Levels I & II including interns	Initial	14	CTC
Reading Language Arts Certificate	Advanced	9	CTC
Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential including interns	Advanced	11	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Counseling	Advanced	108	CTC
Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization	Advanced	2	CTC

### **The Visit**

This was a joint visit with a team from the Commission on Teaching Credentialing using CTC standards for program review. The NCATE and CTC teams met regularly during the visit to exchange information and cross verify findings. The existing state protocol was followed. There were no unusual circumstances affecting this visit.

# NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

## STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

*Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes    ☐ No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<b>1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		X	
<b>1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation</b>		X	
<p><i>Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:</i></p> <p>The California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) is used to assess content knowledge of initial level teacher candidates for Multiple (elementary) and Single (secondary) Subject credentials, as well as Level 1 Education Specialist (special education) credential candidates. The California Lutheran University (CLU) pass rate for program completers was 100% by the time candidates enter the methods course block.</p> <p>Conditions for obtaining California subject matter competence should be noted. (1) All candidates for the Multiple Subject credential must pass the CSET. (2) Single Subject and Education Specialist candidates can meet subject matter competence requirements by passing the CSET in the subject they will teach or by completing a state approved subject matter preparation program.</p> <p>At CLU, each state approved subject matter preparation program includes a capstone course that assesses the candidate's knowledge of content. The unit requires candidates to be fully subject matter competent prior to admission to clinical practice (the full-time student teaching block in a program). Many Single Subject candidates obtain subject matter competence through a state approved program.</p> <p>Content knowledge and its application to teaching is also assessed through grade point averages. At admission, candidates must have a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.7. Candidates must also maintain a 3.0 or better GPA while in a teacher preparation program. Average undergraduate program GPAs for applicants to initial teacher preparation programs for fall 2007 through fall 2008 was 2.83 for candidates not also earning master's degree and 3.54 for candidates earning a master's. The unit also requires candidates to pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) prior to entry to clinical practice which results in a 100% pass rate for program completers. Additionally, all Multiple Subject credential candidates and Level I Education</p>			

Specialist credential candidates must verify that they have the knowledge and skills to provide effective reading instruction by passing the Reading Instructional Competence Assessment (RICA), a state requirement, prior to being credentialed. The unit's overall pass rate on the RICA was 100% for the past three years.

The unit also monitors content knowledge of initial teacher candidates through signature assignments. These are assignments within programs that are aligned with the conceptual framework, candidate standards such as the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), and program goals. California Teaching Performance Expectations are 13 standards for Multiple and Single Subject candidates similar to INTASC standards. On signature assignments instructors rate candidates on TPEs related to content knowledge such as TPE 1 Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction (average rating over the last four semesters was 4.2 on a scale of 1 - 5) and TPE 4 Make Content Accessible (average rating was 3.8). Evidence for this was displayed in Individual Program Assessment Data Summary (IPADS) documents used for reporting assessment information to the state.

For the special education program the unit has developed program outcomes from state standards of candidate competence. Two outcomes are related to content knowledge. Instructors rate candidates on signature assignments related to *planning instruction and design learning experiences for students with special needs* (average rating for the past four semesters was 4.2) and *understanding and organizing subject matter knowledge of special needs students* (average rating 4.5). For the program for teachers of the deaf and hard of hearing two related program outcomes signature assignments are rated. *Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for students with hearing loss* (average rating 4.6), and *understanding and organizing subject matter knowledge for students with hearing loss* (average rating 4.5). Data was available for only one semester in this newer program with a small number of candidates.

Interviews with candidates and other program participants confirmed that the level of candidate content knowledge for teaching is good. Master teachers and administrators speak highly of the content preparation of candidates.

The unit participates in the Comprehensive Evaluation of Teacher Preparation surveys of initial program graduates and employers (supervisors) about graduates' preparation conducted by the California Center for Teacher Quality. Data reported are from surveys administered near the end of the first year of teaching. Eighty percent of program completers and 91 percent of employers report that CLU teacher candidates from 2005 – 2007 were either well or adequately prepared in content knowledge. Similar institution results show that 80 percent of program completers and 91 percent of employers report adequate or better content preparation.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:*

The unit offers advanced programs for teachers that include Education Specialist Level II programs in Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and the MA in Curriculum and Instruction (This program is currently not accepting new candidates during redesign.). Candidates in the MA in Educational Leadership Program can also prepare for teacher leader roles, and the California Reading Certificate can be earned along with the Curriculum and Instruction master's or the Educational Leadership Program. State licensure tests for content knowledge are not available for programs at the advanced level. Candidates in advanced programs



for teaching must hold basic (initial) teaching credentials through which content knowledge was verified.

On admission to these programs the unit rates candidates on a personal statement, an interview, a reflective essay, and letters of recommendation. The unit has developed rubrics for these ratings. Candidates must also have a previous GPA of 3.0 or better or take the Graduate Record Examination, and hold a Level I or Preliminary teaching credential. Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program applicants must also have completed prerequisite courses: EDTP 506 Child and Adolescent Growth and Development, EDTP 521 Literacy and Language in Diverse Classrooms - Elementary, and EDTP 522 Teaching I: Planning and Methods for Content Standards – Elementary or EDTP 522 Teaching I: Planning and Methods for Content Standards – Elementary, as well as a course equivalent to Deaf Culture and American Sign Language.

IPADS documents for each program display data on characteristics related to candidates' content knowledge at admission. For example, For the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Program candidates admitted to the spring 2008 Level II cohort (first cohort) had an average GPA of 3.81. Candidates admitted to the Education Specialist Level II program from fall 2007 through fall 2008 had an average GPA of 3.5.

The unit also monitors content knowledge of advanced teacher candidates through signature assignments. Faculty rate special education candidates at an average of 4.5 on 5-point scale on understanding and organizing subject matter instruction from fall 2006 through spring 2008. During that same period the average rating by master teachers and supervisors was 4.1 on a similar characteristic, planning and implementing instruction, at a mid-program transition point. Another indicator of advanced teacher candidate content knowledge is the classroom based research project completed by master's degree candidates. From fall 2006 through fall 2008 there were 26 completers.

Much of the assessment data for advanced programs for teachers that are connected to other programs or initial credential programs were found to be aggregated across programs.

<b>1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:*

For Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates is related to California Teaching Performance Expectations, TPE 1 (*Making Subject Matter Comprehensible*), TPE 4 (*Making Content Accessible*), and TPE 9 (*Instructional Planning*). Candidates develop pedagogical content skills through foundations and methods courses that, for example, include an introduction to educational psychology, study in child and adolescent development, issues surrounding students with special needs and English language learners and the historical and philosophical context of diversity Examination of course plans shows the unit offers initial programs through a logical sequence of courses.

Prior to admission candidates complete courses in the Foundations Block and at least 40 hours of fieldwork, where candidates serve as participant-observer in public preK-12 classrooms. During

the Methods Block candidates are assigned to classrooms for three half days a week for a semester. Each is mentored by a cooperating teacher and supervised by a university supervisor. Courses include extensive methodology instruction. In the Full-Time Student Teaching Block candidates complete fifteen weeks of student teaching and one advanced methods course.

Multiple and Single Subject candidates are assessed on signature assignments designed to measure progress on the TPEs on a five point scale with five being high. Candidates also self-rate on the TPEs at the end of relevant courses. Combined average ratings of faculty for TPEs 1, 4, and 9 for fall 2006 through spring 2008 was 4.0; self-ratings by candidates for this period averaged 4.15. These programs are transitioning to assessment by the California Teaching Performance Assessment in spring 2009.

The Education Specialist Level I program has established program outcomes related to state standards for candidates. Program outcomes related this element are *plan instruction and design learning experiences for students with special needs* and *understand and organize subject matter knowledge for students with special needs*. The majority of candidates are interns, employed in schools while they complete program coursework that includes foundations and methods courses. The program was designed to provide a cohesive experience for teacher candidates, whether pre-service or in-service. Courses emphasize characteristics common in all children/youth and develop knowledge and skills needed to teach children with exceptional needs as well as diverse learners with special needs. Placements are varied to provide experiences with issues related to people with disabilities, with much done in inclusive and integrated settings. In the Deaf and Hard of Hearing program, aggregated average score on assignments related program outcomes on this element was 4.8.

Candidates are assessed on signature assignments aligned with program outcomes and they prepare electronic portfolios to document their progress. The aggregated rating for program outcomes for this element for fall 2006 through spring 2008 was 4.3 on a 5-point scale with five being high.

In programs, faculty model integration of technology in courses. Candidates submit assignments to their e-portfolios. They are expected to use applications such as Microsoft Office. They also videotape lessons, plan and present lessons using technology and analyze the results. Scores on technology signature assignments averaged 4.0 over recent semesters. Education Specialist candidates learn about the latest technology applications for teaching and helping children with special needs in professional development workshops offered by the county office of education. Interviews confirm that CLU candidates are well prepared to use technology for instructional purposes. Conversations with candidates and cooperating teachers indicate that schools vary in the technology resources available for instruction but many good opportunities exist.

In interviews candidates cited many examples that demonstrated strong pedagogical content knowledge. Cooperating teachers and area administrators spoke highly of the quality and abilities of candidates from CLU.

Comprehensive Evaluation of Teacher Preparation surveys of initial program graduates and employers about graduates' preparation related to Pedagogical Content Knowledge indicate that

88 percent of employers and 89 percent of program completers report that CLU teacher candidates from 2004 – 2006 were well or adequately prepared. Similar institution results show that 86 percent of employers and 81 percent of program completers report that graduates were well or adequately prepared. Over the same period, 87% of CLU graduates felt well or adequately prepared to use computer-based technology in class activities and to keep class records.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:*

**Information for element 1.b. for advanced teacher preparation was included in the IR response to element 1.c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. Candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction Master's program (that includes the Reading Certificate Program Option) are assessed on pedagogical content knowledge through signature assignments and a portfolio defense on program outcomes related to National Board standards.**

**The Reading Certificate Option especially, includes a series of school and student-focused case studies. Aggregated average ratings of candidates by multiple faculty on these outcomes for 2006 through 2007 was 4.5 out of five.**

The unit aggregated data from Educational Specialist M/M and M/S Level II and Deaf and Hard of Hearing Level II related to element 1.b. with data from Level I. Aggregated scores are reported above with initial programs.

1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		X	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:*

**Several California TPEs are related to this element including TPE 5 Student Engagement, TPE 6 Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices, TPE 7 Teaching English Learners, TPE 8 Learning About Students, TPE 10 Instructional Time, TPE 11 Social Environment, TPE 12 Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations, and TPE 13 Professional Growth. Candidates develop professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in program courses and field experiences through which they develop lesson and unit plans, apply instructional strategies in classrooms, and reflect on the results of these teaching experiences.**

**Multiple and Single Subject candidates complete a series of signature assignments that include lesson plans, presentations, case studies, reflections, videos, and reports. The aggregated average score on these assignments for fall 2006 through spring 2008 was 4.2. Candidates' aggregated self-ratings on TPEs related to pedagogical and professional knowledge for the same period was 3.9. Candidates are also rated on their performance on TPEs in school placements and student teaching. Through the period reported in IPADS the vast majority of candidates were rated at the "beginning practice" (highest level).**

**Special education candidates are assessed through coursework and field experiences on program outcomes related to this standard including, create and maintain an effective environment for students with special needs, engage and support all special**

**needs students in learning, represent the different roles of a special educator, including interactions with parents, and develop as a professional special educator. For the fall 2006 through spring 2008 period the aggregated average score for these outcomes was 4.1 out of five. Deaf and hard of hearing program candidates are assessed on program outcomes similar to those listed for education specialist candidates. Data was collected during the time period reviewed through two different rating systems. Across these programs outcomes aggregated averages of candidate scores were at the top rating or very close to the top rating given.**

Comprehensive Evaluation of Teacher Preparation data from initial program completers shows that on selected questions related to professional and pedagogical skills for teachers, 84.3 percent of CLU program completers report that they were either well or adequately prepared, while 86% of supervisors rated them this way. Data is from 2004 – 2006 graduates. Program completers at similar units were rated well or adequately prepared by 78.5% of candidates and 82.7% of employers.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:*

Professional and pedagogical knowledge development in programs at the advanced levels is accomplished through foundations, advanced methodology and field experience courses. In these courses candidates become aware of the political, historical, social and philosophical foundations of education. Candidates are taught about being reflective practitioners and they are given many opportunities to practice self-reflection for their professional growth. Candidates provided ample and impressive examples of reflection and its impact on their progress.

Curriculum and Instruction master's degree candidates do school-based action research projects. Reading Certificate candidates conduct case studies, and develop and implement intervention plans to improve student learning. These candidates demonstrate ability to use research and technology. Aggregated assessment data related to this element showed an average rating of 4.5 out five.

The unit aggregated data from Educational Specialist M/M and M/S Level II and Deaf and Hard of Hearing Level II related to element 1.c. with data from Level I. Aggregated scores are reported above with initial programs.

<b>1d. Student Learning for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>1d. Student Learning for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:*

Basic credential candidates assess students learning and use results to modify instruction to develop successful learning experiences for all students. California TPEs guide preparation and assessment of candidates for this element. Those related are TPE 2 *Monitors Student Learning During Instruction* and TPE 3 *Interpretation and Use of Assessments*. These are measured in the signature assignments that show aggregated average ratings for fall 2006 through spring 2008 of 4.15 on a 5-point scale.

In special education programs, candidates complete signature assignments on program outcomes that address assessing, monitoring, and implementing student-learning activities. The aggregated

average score for candidates in the fall 2006 through 2008 period was 4.2. Aggregated scores on assignments related to state standards that give evidence of the candidates' ability on this element was 4.7.

Comprehensive Teacher Evaluation surveys indicate a high level of candidate preparation. In surveys of program graduates from 2004 – 2006, 84.3% of CLU initial credential graduates reported that they were well or adequately prepared on questions related to this element. Employers rated 86.1% of CLU graduates as well or adequately prepared. Comparison with similar institutions show that employers rate 82.7% as well or adequately prepared teachers and graduates rate 78.5%.

Candidates were able to cite many examples of differentiating instruction to meet the individual cultural, language, and learning needs for the diverse populations of students in area schools. They, and cooperating teachers, reported attending IEP meetings and working with special education teachers. Examples of activities are documented in candidate work samples reviewed during the visit.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:*

The Curriculum and Instruction master's degree program assesses candidates on two outcomes for this element. They are, understanding social and cultural influences that impact students' learning experiences and environment (aggregated recent portfolio defense score was 4.6 on a 5-point scale), and using the most current and research-based teaching and assessment techniques to meet the educational needs of all students (aggregated portfolio defense score of 4.5).

**1e. Professional Knowledge for Other School Professionals**

**X**

*Summary of Findings:*

CLU offers programs for other school personnel. These are the Educational Leadership Program (for the California Administrative Services Credential) and the School Counselor Program (for the Pupil Personnel Services credential with additional certification for Child Welfare and Attendance).

Candidates are assessed on goals related to professional knowledge for both programs. For Educational Leadership the goal is: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture, and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. The aggregated average signature assignment score related to this goal was 3.7 on a 4-point scale over the past three years. Candidate portfolios are also scored on this goal. The aggregated score for the last four cohorts was 4.4 a 5-point scale.

School counselor candidates are assessed on designing, implementing, and evaluating standards-driven, comprehensive counseling and guidance programs in K-12 schools that are need-based. The signature assignment for this goal is an analysis paper on an ASCA model program. The aggregated average score of candidates from fall 2006 through summer 2008 was 4.7 on a 5-point scale. The aggregated score on the related comprehensive exam question was 3.4 also on a 5-point scale.

The Doctor of Education degree program is offered in two versions, Educational Leadership (K-

12) and Higher Education Leadership. The Educational Leadership K-12 program is designed to empower professionals to enhance their abilities and position them for heightened leadership roles. The program provides the conceptual lenses, tools of inquiry, and values to positively influence educational organizations and the people who learn and work in them through seven main goals:

1. Modeling moral and ethical practice
2. Leading organizational change in a diverse society
3. Establishing a caring and collaborative learning community
4. Supporting the principles of teaching and learning
5. Utilizing the principles of effective administration and technology
6. Evaluating the individual organizational and societal contexts of education
7. Designing research that addresses education issues

The Higher Education Leadership program is designed to increase competence in ten areas of professional practice. They are:

1. The context of education
2. Student success
3. Teaching and learning
4. Leading change
5. Management and administration
6. Diversity and intercultural maturity
7. Research skills that make a difference
8. Technology
9. Moral and ethical practice
10. Care and collaboration

At admission candidates are rated on their educational backgrounds, GRE scores, professional experience, scholarly productivity and/or promise, and program fit and/or promise. The aggregated average admission score rating for six recent cohorts was 3.4 on a 4-point scale.

Throughout the programs candidates are assessed on signature assignments that address issues of educational foundations and history, leadership, practice, and policy. Issues regarding the relationship of education and technology, the importance of working with communities and families are explored, and candidates acquire an understanding of current research methodology.

The aggregated average of scores on signature assignments from fall 2006 through spring 2008 was 3.96 on a 4-point scale.

The Ed.D. dissertation is a culminating experience that provides doctoral students with opportunities to apply their skills as educational leaders to the complex problems and issues facing contemporary educational organizations. Twenty-six of 32 candidates have successfully completed dissertations since the programs began in 2002.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, and faculty confirmed and strengthened perceptions of these advanced programs as being highly effective for extending the learning of educational professionals. Many interviewees talked about the community and family feelings they have for their faculty and program colleagues.

<b>1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals</b>		<b>X</b>	
<i>Summary of Findings:</i>			

Candidates in programs for other school personnel are prepared to use assessment and research data to establish and modify environments, instruction and processes to support student learning in their areas of responsibility. Candidates complete assignments related to this element.

School counseling candidates collect and analyze data on student learning and apply strategies for improving student learning in their instructional settings. They are rated on program goals related to counseling students on personal and social development, academic development, and the effect of social and cultural influences on learning. The aggregated score for signature assignments from fall 2006 through spring 2008 is 4.38 on a 5-point scale. The aggregated comprehensive exam score for the same period is 3.7 on a 4-point scale or a 100% pass rate.

Educational administration candidates develop vision statements to lead schools. The CLU program assesses candidates' ability to create positive environments for students, interact with families and understand policy contexts in a number of ways. Candidates complete assignments and are scored on assessments that measure their ability to promotes success of all students by:

- advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth
- collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
- understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The aggregated average scores for assignments related to these program goals for fall 2006 through spring 2008 was 4.95 for assignments scored on a 5-point scale, 3.8 for assignments scored on a 4-point scale, and 4.4 for portfolios scores on a 5-point scale.

Candidates in the doctoral program for educational leaders (K-12) and higher education also focus on student learning. Scores on assignments related to goals on student learning are aggregated with scores in the information above on element 1.e.

In interviews, candidates and graduates of programs for other school professionals commented on the quality and value of these programs in furthering their professional goals and in making them more effective educators.

<b>1g. Professional Dispositions</b>		<b>X</b>	
--------------------------------------	--	----------	--

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

As part of the conceptual framework, built on the concept that “reflective principled educators” STRIVE to . . . The STRIVE acronym defines candidate’s dispositions for all candidates in initial and advanced programs. The concepts associated with STRIVE are:

- Serve as mentors for moral and ethical leadership,
- Think critically to connect theory with practice,
- Respect all individuals,
- Include and respond to the needs of all learners,
- Value diversity, and
- Empower individuals to participate in educational growth and change.

These dispositions have been a guide to unit programs for several years. Dispositions are communicated with candidates through numerous materials including program brochures, all syllabi, assessments, School of Education website and especially through courses and

experiences. They form the basis for many candidate reflections. Candidates, faculty, and community partners across most programs were aware of, and discussed the unit's dispositions. In interviews, candidates and faculty provided examples of activities to help candidates learn about the dispositions, and importantly about the positive effects of the STRIVE system on how they think about professional education as well as their personal and professional growth.

The dispositions are brought to fruition "through engagement in" a series of ACTION statements. Dispositions are assessed at numerous points throughout each program. Ratings of candidates on dispositions are made by faculty, as part of scoring of some signature assignments, by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and other district-employed supervisors, and candidates make self-ratings. The unit maintains aggregated ratings of dispositions in unit assessment reports, the IPADS documents.

Interviews with candidates, faculty, staff, and others associated with each initial and advanced program indicated an awareness of, and recognition of the importance of dispositions to the overall distinctiveness of CLU programs and individual candidates.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation*

The statement in the Summary of Findings for Initial Programs statement above applies to professional dispositions for candidates in advanced teacher preparation programs.

*Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

The statement in the Summary of Findings for Initial Programs statement above applies to professional dispositions for candidates in advanced programs for other school personnel.

Data on disposition ratings is displayed on a variety of forms specific to each program and reported in that program's IPADS document. By program completion all candidates are at an acceptable level for STRIVE dispositions.

*Overall Assessment of the Standard*

Candidates participating in California Lutheran University, School of Education are being well prepared as educators across the elements of Standard 1. Candidate dispositions are specifically delineated clearly communicated and appear to be applied by all members of the CLU educational community, and frequently assessed. The unit offers programs that have carefully planned sequences of courses and experiences to ensure that all candidates have sufficient professional, pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge and skills to have a positive impact on learning for the students with whom they will come in contact.

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales:**

- AFI's corrected from last visit –

1. The unit lacks evidence that single subject candidates are acquiring the content-specific pedagogy needed to teach their content well. (ITP) (ADV)

*Rationale: The unit now offers content specific pedagogy courses for Single Subject candidates taught by subject area specialists and K-12 teachers who teach these subjects and have recognized expertise in the pedagogy of these subjects.*



- AFIIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIIs - None

**NCATE Recommendation for Standard 1 Initial - Met**

**NCATE Recommendation for Standard 1 Advanced – Met**

**State Team Decision: Met**

**Corrections to the Institutional Report: None**

## STANDARD 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

*The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.*

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes      ☐ No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<b>2a. Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>2a. Assessment System – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<p><i>Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation</i></p> <p>As noted in the Assessment Handbook and program IPADS, the unit's assessment system clearly reflects the conceptual framework's STRIVE statements and consistently refers to professional and institutional standards. A review of the biennial IPADS reports reveals initial program assessments all closely linked to the California Teaching Performance Expectations and data aggregated around these standards. An advisory committee of area education leaders has discussed aspects of the assessment system, and it is regularly reviewed at SOE faculty meetings. Through these processes, the unit has continued to improve its assessment system and is in the process of moving all processes to TaskStream electronic portfolio. The assessment system includes a wide range of evaluation measures at five transition points. At admission, assessment data is compiled in areas such as GPA, interview, personal statement, and letter of recommendation. Entry and exit from clinical practice include assessment data on numerous signature assignments, self and faculty assessments, pre-student teaching and student teaching assessments. Program completion data include exit survey data. Finally, alumni and employment data is available from a unit alumni and employer survey as well as the California State University Chancellor's Office Survey. Course evaluation data is also carefully reviewed by course, instructor, program and site. The assessment system allows for decisions to be made about candidate performance based on the use of data readily available to faculty and administrators. Faculty has collaborated within their departments in developing signature assignments including eliminating bias in assessments. Little effort appears to have been made toward ensuring the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment procedures. Cooperating teachers reported some concerns regarding their understandings of scoring procedures. Most rubrics used in scoring remain basic and do not describe specific behaviors assigned to scores. While discussions of assessment data occurred at unit and department faculty meetings, minimal evidence was found for faculty discussion or training around consistent scoring of assessments. No validity studies have been done. While some initial programs are moving to a state-mandated performance assessment requiring extensive training and validity assurances, these trainings have just been initiated and only for multiple subject and single subject programs.</p>			
<p><i>Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals</i></p> <p>The unit assessment system noted above for the most part remains in place at the advanced level.</p>			

A review of the biennial IPADS reports reveals advanced program assessments are linked to the appropriate California professional standards. The addition of advanced programs during the last five years has resulted in additional discussion and development of assessment components into some advanced programs and more in-depth review by the advisory committee of area education leaders. The assessment system includes a wide range of evaluation measures at five transition points. At admission, assessment data is compiled in areas such as GPA, interview, personal statement, and letter of recommendation. Completion of coursework includes such areas as assessment data on numerous signature assignments, self and supervisor ratings, and comprehensive exams or defense. Program completion data include exit survey data. Finally, alumni and employment data is available from an alumni and employer survey. Course evaluation data is also carefully reviewed by course, instructor, program and site. The assessment system allows for decisions to be made about candidate performance based on the use of data readily available to faculty and administrators. Faculty has collaborated within their departments in developing signature assignments including eliminating bias in assessments. Only limited effort appears to have been made toward ensuring the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment procedures. Some supervisors in leadership programs reported concerns regarding their understandings of scoring procedures. Although some departments have begun further development of rubrics, many rubrics used in scoring remain basic and do not describe specific behaviors assigned to scores. For instance, the doctoral program has developed in-depth rubrics for some courses but has not yet calibrated them. While discussions of assessment data occurred at unit and department faculty meetings, minimal evidence was found for faculty discussion or training around consistent scoring of assessments. No validity studies have been done.

<b>2b. Data Collection, Analysis, &amp; Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>2b. Data Collection, Analysis, &amp; Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

The unit has designed and maintains a comprehensive system for collecting, analyzing, and evaluating data within its assessment system. A unit assessment committee oversees the assessment process for the unit and coordinates with departments and programs. SOE graduate admissions staff input admissions data for all candidates in a paper file and in the university's Datatel student database upon admission to the university. A credentials analyst then creates an Access file for each candidate through which most transition point and field experience placement information is recorded, including test completion. All unit faculty and staff have access to this database through a shared common v-drive and can use this information with students individually or to review group data. Program directors, department chairs, and staff compile transition data reports from this database for reporting to program and unit faculty at department and unit meetings and unit assessment retreats. In 1999, the unit created an electronic portfolio system, Profport, for grading, feedback, analysis, and compilation of candidate work, including the signature assignments, journals, and field placement evaluations. This system allowed the unit to compile candidate assessment data by program and unit. Assessment data is organized by professional (state) standards or institutional (STRIVE) standards. Given evolving technology and personnel changes, the unit is in the process of moving to the TaskStream electronic portfolio system to allow for greater flexibility in data analysis and reporting. Other candidate assessment data collected outside these systems include exit surveys, student course evaluations, alumni and

employer surveys, and the CSU Chancellor's Office Survey. Data from these sources are compiled for the biennial IPADS report to the California CTC. These program reports include survey and other indicated data disaggregated for each program. Faculty meeting minutes and agendas along with faculty interviews confirm that data from these sources are regularly reviewed and analyzed by program and unit faculty. The unit's Data Collection Plan outlines the ongoing review and analysis of data, timelines for collecting and reviewing data, and where data are stored. The unit has just recently established a calendar to ensure assessment data is reviewed within established program and SOE meetings throughout the academic year. At this point, assessment practices cohere to reflect a unit-wide system with clear purposes for program data and unit data. The unit has no alternative routes, unique off-campus or distance learning programs for initial candidates. Records of candidate complaints are kept in individual advising files, including all notes and formal correspondence and records of resolutions. The Assistant Dean is charged with oversight of student concerns across the unit. Given the small size of the program faculty within areas, candidate complaint information and resulting recommendations for changes are discussed at program faculty meetings.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

The unit assessment system is for the most part the same for initial and advanced candidates and programs. Datatel and the v-drive are similarly used for advanced programs, although the v-drive does not include the credential information initial programs require. Advanced programs have likewise been using the Profport electronic portfolio system except for the Pupil Personnel Services credential programs. Those programs have been compiling significant assessment data by hand, but will be making the transition to TaskStream along with all other programs beginning this summer (2009). While somewhat different assessment instruments and data sources are used, minutes and interviews confirm that advanced program faculty and unit staff regularly review and analyze program and unit data. Two off-campus cohorts within the Pupil Personnel Services credential program are included within PPS data and are not regularly disaggregated except for student course evaluation data, comprehensive examination results, and narrative focus group data. While additional data from these cohorts can be easily disaggregated, program faculty has not seen the need to disaggregate based on the continued success of these cohorts. Advanced programs likewise fit within the unit assessment system as noted for initial programs above and maintain similar processes for candidate complaints.

<b>2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

The unit has provided evidence that they regularly use assessment data to evaluate courses, programs, and clinical experiences. Minutes, reports, and interviews revealed student course evaluation data are systematically analyzed by faculty, directors, and unit administrators to review the performance of regular and part-time faculty and their courses. Course evaluation data are aggregated across the unit as well as disaggregated by program and location for further analysis. IPADS reports, minutes, and interviews confirmed faculty review assessment data as part of the evaluation of programs and clinical experiences. Assessment retreats have focused more recently specifically on the review of assessment data for program evaluation and the unit intends to more systematically infuse the review of assessment data into regular unit and program

faculty meetings. The IPADS reports identify many changes initiated by programs and the unit over the last several years. Of the 38 initial program decisions/actions reported in the IPADS, approximately 15 were based on some type of assessment data or collection of candidate feedback. Interviews with candidates, faculty, and P12 partners appeared to verify that the unit and programs are responsive to feedback from candidates and from the analysis of assessment data and do not hesitate to initiate changes in programs and unit operations. The unit has established an effective technology-based system for accessing candidate assessment data through the V drive and ProfPort Webfolio available to all faculty. In particular, the ProfPort Webfolio allows faculty to readily share assessment feedback with candidates. Candidates in interviews spoke highly of the ease of its use and availability of feedback. Course evaluation feedback has been regularly provided to all faculty, both part and full time, and has recently been transitioned to a web-based system. This allows for more timely access for faculty to receive candidate feedback on their courses and teaching.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

Advanced programs mirror the findings listed above for initial programs. The changes initiated by programs and the unit over the last several years reported in IPADS reports identify 39 advanced program decisions/actions of which approximately 25 were based on some type of assessment data or collection of candidate feedback. Interviews likewise verified the responsiveness of advanced programs to feedback from candidates and from the analysis of assessment data.

### **Overall Assessment of the Standard**

The unit has a clearly articulated and functioning assessment system in place that effectively uses technology to collect data from initial programs, advanced programs, and the unit as a whole. The assessment system includes a variety of evaluation measures aligned with standards and tied to clear transition points throughout programs. While the unit has made significant strides in developing and implementing assessments throughout programs, evidence is lacking that scoring ensures fairness, accuracy and consistency. The unit has developed systems to collect, analyze and evaluate assessment results. Staff and technology resources are committed to data collection, recording, aggregating and disaggregating using technology-based programs. Data are regularly compiled, summarized and analyzed by faculty as programs and as a unit. Numerous examples were provided of changes made to programs, many of them guided by evaluation of data.

### **Areas for Improvement and Rationales:**

- AFI corrected from last visit –

1. Assessment practices as delineated in the assessment plan do not reflect a unit-wide coherent system. (ITP) (ADV)

*Rationale: The unit has made continued progress toward a unit-wide coherent system through the creation of signature assignments in every program, clear common transition points across programs, and the compilation of unit data from alumni, employer, exit, and state surveys and course evaluations. Unit-wide use of common systems for the collection and analysis of data were noted.*

2. Portfolio data have not been systematically aggregated, and survey data have not been disaggregated for some programs. (ITP) (ADV)

*Rationale: The unit has made continued improvements in its ProfPort electronic portfolio software to allow for aggregation of assessment data from the electronic portfolio. The unit has disaggregated survey and other data for each of its programs to report in its biennial IPADS reports.*

- AFI continued from last visit –

3. Procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessment of candidate performance were not available. (ITP) (ADV)

*Rationale: While the unit has developed signature assignments in each program through faculty input and collaboration, there is little evidence that the scoring of these assignments has ensured fairness, accuracy, and consistency. Most rubrics used in the scoring remain basic and does not describe specific behaviors. Minimal evidence was found for faculty discussion or training around consistent scoring of assessments.*

- New AFIs - None

**NCATE Recommendation for Standard 2 Initial Teacher Preparation - Met**

**NCATE Recommendation for Standard 2 Advanced Preparation - Met**

**State Team Decision: Met**

**Corrections to the Institutional Report: None**

### STANDARD 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

*The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.*

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes      ☐ No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<b>3a. Collaboration between Unit &amp; School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>3a. Collaboration between Unit &amp; School Partners – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

The unit has a strong collaborative relationship with several partners in the area, including one Professional Development School and one partner school working toward the PDS designation. Methods courses are taught at PDS schools, which provides mutual benefits. School and unit faculty report satisfaction with the arrangement. Many adjunct faculty used either currently work at or have retired from working in the local schools, providing a good foundation for collaboration on field and clinical experiences. Both school faculty and unit supervisors report opportunities for input through frequent contact and respectful relationships.

The unit has an Advisory Committee for formal input from the field. Meeting minutes verify partner input, from suggesting a cooperating teacher orientation to discussion of making the secondary candidate placement easier. Committee members cited other examples of response to their input. For example, the special education program embedded learning about autism in coursework, and the secondary methods, once taught to all candidates together, is now separated by content area and usually taught by a qualified local practitioner. Documents provide examples of partnerships for grants and projects that have strengthened the relationships.

The Directors of Field Experiences work closely with schools to place candidates appropriately and monitor candidates' development. Documents and interviews with the Director and school faculty show that the unit identified sites that met its standards. The Director met with the principal and staff to orient them to the unit's purpose in field experiences, then solicited placements in those schools. The principal or designee works with the unit to find cooperating teachers. Handbooks and orientations clearly outline the expectations and process, and cooperating teachers sign an agreement to provide the support and resources expected. If a placement seems problematic, the supervisor works with the school faculty to improve the situation and determine if a change is advisable. School faculty interviews indicated the unit supervisors and placement director work collaboratively on these concerns.

The unit and partners share expertise to support candidate development. Local practitioners are invited to take part in professional development offered by the unit; some reported participation in the cost-free opportunity. The unit provides training for cooperating teachers and principals,

and over 80 people attended the sessions in 2007-08. Many school faculty reported that the orientation was useful. Monitoring by both cooperating teachers and supervisors support candidate learning and outline strengths and areas for continued growth. The cooperating teacher and unit supervisor meet to share their observations. Input from the school faculty helps direct changes in the program, such as revisions to the observation forms and moving observations for candidates to the beginning of the week.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

Collaboration with partners is similar for Advanced Teacher Preparation and Other School Professionals. Partners serve on the Advisory Committee. Documents and interviews confirmed joint endeavors that benefit both the partners and the unit, including efforts to expand the use of Lesson One (a social-emotions curriculum) in Ventura District, work with a cochlear implant manufacturer to provide educational materials, and reading professional development for local teachers.

The Program Director and/or field coordinators work with the field to place candidates appropriately. Since these candidates are frequently employed by a district, collaboration is used to find a qualified supervisor within the system. Because the unit has a strong relationship with the nearby schools and communities and often can find a qualified unit graduate or adjunct faculty member to serve as a site supervisor, appropriate supervision can be identified at the sites. Field handbooks in the various programs outline the supervisor qualifications and expectations of the school faculty and the process for guiding the candidate through the experience. The site supervisors and unit supervisors both provide feedback and support for the candidates and meet regularly with them. If the two supervisors are not able to meet after an evaluation, there is timely communication about the monitoring. Candidate interviews verify a high level of support.

<b>3b. Design, Implementation, &amp; Evaluation of Field Experiences &amp; Clinical Practices – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>3b. Design, Implementation, &amp; Evaluation of Field Experiences &amp; Clinical Practices – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

Documents and interviews confirmed established transition point assessments that ensure that candidates meet entry and exit criteria for clinical practice. The design and assessment of those experiences reflect the conceptual framework, standards and program outcomes. Candidate and school faculty interviews indicated they understood the expectations.

Forty-five hours of field experiences are embedded in foundations courses prior to the methods course of 192 hours. The experiences begin with focused observation activities and progress to varied, more demanding tasks. The field experience requires a three day takeover; that experience and feedback help prepare candidates for the more rigorous 16-week clinical practice. A review of syllabi and candidate work samples confirm the developmental nature.

Technology use is integrated into the initial Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs. Candidates use technology in coursework. Candidate interviews confirm technology use with students. Cooperating teachers praise the candidates' technology skills. Lesson plans require



assessment strategies for all lessons, and the assignment for TPE3 requires an extensive review of the assessment plan and data.

Teacher education candidates receive frequent feedback. Supervisors observe at least 6 times during fieldwork and 12 times during clinicals and provide feedback on each program outcome. Two formal assessments are given. Seminars once a week during clinicals provide additional support and feedback from peers. Candidates report they feel well prepared and supported. If issues arise, the unit supervisor meets with the candidate and school faculty, and an Intervention Plan is initiated if necessary. School faculty are impressed by unit level of involvement.

The unit selects school-based clinical faculty carefully. The handbook clearly outlines the standards, and the unit works closely with the principal to identify cooperating teachers. The unit maintains a list of cooperating teachers who have met the unit's standards, and candidates evaluate the cooperating teachers.

Unit supervisors are carefully selected, often from recently retired practitioners or current teachers provided leave time by the unit. Supervisors attend an orientation and at least three meetings each semester. The use of a supervisor is reconsidered after concerns are repeated. Cooperating teacher and principal interviews were very complimentary about supervisors, who are seen as easily accessible, in continual contact, and supportive.

The Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe programs are similar. The candidates participate in 140 hours of field experience before the 600 hours of clinical experience. The program requires two different placements, and the field coordinator's relationship with schools helps provide many sites and qualified site supervisors. The unit supervisor meets with the site supervisor and provides the expectations and orientation. The unit supervisor observes candidates six times during the clinical practices and provides written feedback. Candidates report satisfaction with the supervision. Candidates pass a benchmark each semester, which focuses the learning and evaluation. The coursework requires use of technology, and working with diverse learners is embedded in coursework and each evaluation. The Deaf/Hard of Hearing Special Education program is similar, with 107 hours of field experiences and 230 hours of clinical practice.

Field experiences differ somewhat for MS and SS interns. The unit requires completion of the foundation courses, which include fieldwork hours, prior to methods, and the district provides a mentor teacher and a site supervisor who also evaluates. For special education interns, the unit works with the county to train appropriately credentialed peer coaches. The internship program is being phased out of most initial programs other than special education. Most special education interns have been practicum candidates for two semesters or more before becoming an intern.

#### *Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

The design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice for advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals are handled similarly. Documents verify entrance and exit criteria for each program. The fieldwork is generally embedded in the courses. In the Pupil Personnel Services program, the practicum experience is 100 hours including both observation and counseling practice; the clinical practice requires 600 hours at two different

public school levels. For the reading program, 40 field experience hours are required throughout the program. The Educational Leadership Administrative Services program has 160 hours of fieldwork embedded in three semester of courses; more than one level placement is required, and candidates go to the Leadership Training Center for one placement with a site supervisor who can guide the candidates through the activities at the level different than their work place.

All programs require work with diverse groups and placement at more than one site. Use of technology is embedded in each program. Likewise, each program requires research and analysis of data.

Fieldwork is evaluated by the instructor according to a rubric reflecting the conceptual framework, state and national standards, and program outcomes. At the practicum level, candidates receive feedback from both the unit and site supervisor. Site supervisors must meet the outlined criteria and be accomplished professionals. Expectations are either specified in a field handbook or checklist and reviewed through discussions with the unit supervisor. Except for the Ed Leadership program, there are frequent contacts between unit and site supervisors as candidates progress. Assessment tools used throughout the programs give feedback specific to the framework, standards and outcomes. A review of the documents and interviews with Program Directors confirm that the assessments are developmental. Candidates report appreciation for the support they receive from both site and unit supervisors.

Field experiences for interns in the counseling program are monitored somewhat differently. They are supervised by an appropriately credentialed site supervisor who works closely with the unit supervisor. Other advanced programs, Master's in Education and Master's in Special Education, also handle fieldwork a little differently. A portion is an induction program which is district based and governed by state education codes. The action-based research element is generally done in the workplace and evaluated by the instructor.

<b>3c. Candidates' Development &amp; Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, &amp; Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>3c. Candidates' Development &amp; Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, &amp; Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

Before initial candidates begin the methods work and clinical practices, they have been routinely assessed on the conceptual framework, state standards, and program outcomes through signature assignments. Their webfolios, soon to be restructured to use TaskStream, provide a continuum of assessment that reflects their professional growth. The assessment tools used for fieldwork and student teaching are also clearly linked to the framework, standards, and outcomes and add to the record of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The candidates are assessed at each of the 6 observations during fieldwork and the 12 during clinical practices by the supervisor. The cooperating teacher uses the same tool for assessment, providing multiple measures of candidate performance and learning.

Candidates are required to keep a journal reflecting on their growth. The lesson plan format

requires reflection on the success of the lesson, which gives the candidate the opportunity to self assess. Several school faculty commented on this requirement and saw it as instrumental in helping the candidates develop a reflective approach. A number of assignments, such as the Focus Lesson plan, demand more in-depth self-analysis, including analysis of data on student learning.

Candidates must reach a score of 44 or higher on the final evaluation by both the cooperating teacher and the supervisor to pass. Interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, and principals verify these aspects of the program. Candidates feel very prepared to work in the classroom, and school faculty are impressed by their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Candidates are enrolled in seminars during the field and clinical experiences, and those meetings give candidates a chance to interact with their peers and provide feedback for each other. Candidates and unit supervisors verify this practice.

Candidates are ensured field experiences with diverse student populations at some point in the program. A foundations course prior to methods work focuses on diverse learners and requires hours of field experience observing the learning of a student and reflecting on the success. Schools with a rich diversity are readily available, and some schools often host candidates for particular field activities. Most MS and SS candidates do the methods work in the diverse Professional Development Schools. If not, the placements are tracked to ensure a diverse experience.

#### *Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

The advanced teacher and other school professionals preparation programs require that candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn. Their assessment tools are also aligned to the framework, standards and outcomes and provide an ongoing measure of the candidates' progress. The candidate, the site supervisor, and the unit supervisor assess progress throughout the program. Each program outcome has multiple measures, often through specific assignments or tasks and supervisor assessment.

Each program has an outcome related to the impact on student learning to ensure a specific measure of the candidate's success in that area. Each program includes specific work with a diverse student or diverse student populations, including students with exceptionalities. Each program includes some form of formal reflection, often a journal or log, which requires the candidates to reflect on their success on each outcome of the program. Courses provide time for peers to provide feedback. This is especially true for the program with cohorts, such as the counseling cohort at Oxnard or the doctoral cohort. Candidates expressed comfort with the process and familiarity with the expectations of the program. They were appreciative of the support provided by the unit and site supervisors and particularly appreciative of the feedback from the current or retired practitioners in the field who served as their supervisors. They brought a real-world element to the program. A review of sample candidate work verified the alignment with the framework, standards, and outcomes and the element of reflection required.

### **Overall Assessment of the Standard**

The unit collaborates with its school partners to design, deliver, and evaluate the field and clinical experiences. These experiences are designed to help candidates develop and demonstrate the

knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. The unit provides quality school and clinical faculty to guide the candidates as they complete the experiences and provide meaningful assessments throughout the process. Reflection and feedback are incorporated into all programs.

#### **Areas for Improvement and Rationales:**

- AFI's corrected from last visit –

1. The unit lacks documentation to show that all cooperating teachers meet established criteria for accomplished school professionals. (ITP) (ADV)

*Rationale: In the handbooks and program descriptions the unit has clear criteria established for cooperating teachers and works closely with the principal or designee to select appropriate cooperating teachers.*

2. The unit does not ensure that all interns are consistently assigned mentor teachers in their content areas. (ITP) (ADV)

*Rationale: For initial MS and SS program interns, the district agrees in the memorandum of understanding to provide a peer coach. A peer coach is provided for special education interns by the district. For the counseling interns, a credentialed site supervisor is provided for support. The internship program is being phased out of most programs other than special education and counseling.*

- AFI's continued from last visit - None
- New AFI's - None

**NCATE Recommendation for Standard 3 Initial Teacher Preparation - Met**

**NCATE Recommendation for Standard 3 Advanced Preparation - Met**

**State Team Decision: Met**

**Corrections to the Institutional Report: None**

## STANDARD 4. Diversity

*The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.*

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

☒ Yes      ☐ No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<b>4a. Design, Implementation, &amp; Evaluation of Curriculum &amp; Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>4a. Design, Implementation, &amp; Evaluation of Curriculum &amp; Experiences – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

Candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate diversity-related proficiencies and sensitivities that are clearly articulated in the unit’s conceptual framework and STRIVE dispositions. Guided by California Standards for Teacher Credentialing, California Teaching Performance Expectations and program outcomes drawn from these standards and statements, all aspects of the design, implementation and evaluation of curriculum and experiences by the unit have integrated opportunities for initial credential program candidates to learn about issues and practices related to diversity. In initial programs instruction on diversity begins in foundations courses. Syllabi for Multiple and Single Subject Programs, Education Specialist Level I and Deaf and Hard of Hearing Programs show that diversity outcomes have been integrated throughout programs.

Interviews, programs of study, reflective writing, and assessments reveal that there are required coursework and experiences are in place to enable teacher candidates to develop awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. The same artifacts enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations including being sensitive to gender, socioeconomic, language, sexual preference, ability, and religious differences. Candidates develop lessons and units with adaptations for diverse student populations including English learners, as well as for cultural differences, diverse learning styles and students’ special needs. They observe special educators, general educators working in inclusive settings, and other school personnel working to meet diversity needs, and they acquire experiences working with diverse student populations.

An example of the seriousness with which the unit approaches learning about diversity in education is shown in the recent move to new partner schools and away from previous partner schools to increase the experiences candidates have to work with and learn about diverse

students.

Candidates are assessed on outcomes related to diversity. IPADS indicates that the aggregated ratings of Multiple and Single Subject candidates on TPEs related to diversity was 4.0 for the period fall 2006 through spring 2008. For Level I and II special education candidates the aggregated rating on program outcomes related to diversity was 4.3 for the same period. The aggregated assessment score for outcomes related to diversity for deaf and hard of hearing candidates was in the top rubric category.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

Candidates in advanced programs are expected to develop and demonstrate the same diversity-related proficiencies and sensitivities that are articulated in the unit's conceptual framework and STRIVE dispositions. Learning about diversity and practices related to work in schools with diverse populations including sensitivity to gender, socioeconomic, language, sexual preference, ability, and religious differences are integrated throughout advanced programs.

Advanced programs feature instruction in educational foundations and history, and course syllabi for advanced programs show that diversity outcomes have been integrated throughout the curriculums of these programs. Interviews with candidates and faculty confirmed learning opportunities, reflections on service to diverse populations and the importance in which this learning and service for all school clients is held.

Candidates are assessed on outcomes related to diversity at multiple points throughout programs. IPADS indicates that the aggregated score for candidates in Educational Leadership (Administrative Services credential program) is 4.5 on a 5-point scale for the period fall 2006 through spring 2008. For the Reading Certificate Program the aggregated score for program outcomes related to diversity is 3.9 on 4-point scale. The aggregated candidate rating or the school counselor candidates on program outcomes focused on diversity was 4.9 on a 5-point scale for the period of review.

Interviews with program candidates revealed the depth of nuanced thinking about issues of diversity and how to best serve diverse student populations and their families and communities for educational success. Many candidates offered that these issues were common topics for discussions, readings, and experiences within their programs.

<b>4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

The professional education faculty in all initial and advanced programs is predominantly white (82 percent). Faculty Demographics Data (Table 8, IR. ) indicate that the faculty diversity in the unit is almost the same when compared to the university. Thirty-two percent of the unit's full time faculty are male and sixty-eight percent are female while the university overall faculty is 46 percent female.

Since the last NCATE visit in the fall of 2003, the unit has made consistent movement toward

increasing the diversity of overall faculty which includes full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and clinical faculty. One condition for being hired at CLU is a commitment to diversity. Restating its commitment to increasing diversity in the unit and in the university, In 2003, the James Irvine Foundation awarded CLU a \$400,000 grant as part of the foundation's Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI) which made it possible to provide workshop training for faculty hiring committee, providing research incentive and opportunity for potential new faculty of color.

The unit's efforts to recruit and retain racially and culturally diverse faculty members are supported by the Director of Diversity and Equal Opportunity (also referred to as the Director of Multicultural Affairs) who strongly stated that they are committed to vigorously recruiting minority faculty members.

The President also supports diversity efforts and CLU's strategic plan includes a diversity goal. Two aspects of the plan included "providing research incentives and opportunities for potential new faculty of color." and "Mentoring and support for all new faculty to help with retention and success."

Both initial and advanced candidates interact with higher education and school faculty from diverse backgrounds through courses that are taught by adjunct faculty of diverse background. Many of whom successful practicing teachers. A review of the IR, indicates that the university has increased its faculty diversity university-wide from 14 percent to 18 percent. This was confirmed by program coordinators.

Faculty Demographics Data also indicate that the faculty diversity in the unit is almost the same when compared to the university. Within the Education Department, there are twenty-two full-time faculty members. Gender demographics are male (32%) and female (68%). Ethnic demographics are Black, non Hispanic (5%) and Caucasian (82%). All full-time faculty have experiences with diverse populations. Some experiences are teaching students with exceptionalities, ELL students, and different ethnic/cultures students.

As part of the faculty search process, in addition to nationwide advertisement, intensive in state advertisement takes place to increase the diversity of the applicant pool. The CDI is charged with reviewing all diversity and retention-related issues.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

Because the same faculty teach equally at the initial and advanced level, candidates opportunity to work with diverse faculty is the same for initial and advanced levels. See the detailed response in the *summary of findings for initial teacher preparation*.

**4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates  
– Initial Teacher Preparation**

**X**

**4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates  
– Advanced Preparation**

**X**

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

The unit candidates represent a wide range of diversity. There are candidates from urban and rural areas, first generation immigrants, second language learners, and second career professionals. This diversity reflects the diversity of the geographic area. The university students overall are 56 percent White or non Hispanic compared to 69 percent in the unit initial programs. The next

largest ethnic population is Hispanic at 15 percent for initial candidates; other ethnicities are sparsely represented. Unit candidates are more likely to be female: 76 percent of initial candidates. A review of the data showed that diversity is spread throughout the programs.

Candidates in all programs work collaboratively, interact with their peers in that program, and have opportunities to work with candidates from diverse backgrounds on projects and group activities. For example, candidates reported presenting a summary of the important points of a textbook with partners. Additional candidate interviews verified this opportunity, and observed groups on campus, such as a seminar group or a methods class, were diverse, appeared comfortable working and interacting with each other, and were appreciative of varying perspectives.

The unit strives to maintain and increase the diversity represented by their candidates. The unit catalogs document that the unit is committed to an equal opportunity to all persons and does not discriminate. Recruiting efforts reach out into Los Angeles, Ventura, and Santa Barbara counties and use media that might reach underrepresented populations. The graduate centers and other campuses in the broader Los Angeles and Ventura communities have helped increase the candidate diversity. Candidates report that favorable comments from the unit candidates, graduates, and community members were the most significant factor in bringing them to the unit.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

The findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and Other School Personnel were similar with a range of diversity in a variety of categories. Forty-two percent of the advanced candidates are White or non Hispanic, with Hispanic as the next largest ethnic group at 34 percent. Female candidates are more common at 69 percent of the advanced population. A review of the data showed that the diversity was spread throughout programs and unit campuses. Advanced candidates and faculty reported a varied mix of candidates in most courses and opportunities to interact with diverse peers. Recruiting efforts are similar at this level.

<b>4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students to P-12 Schools</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students to P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation*

Program directors and the Director of Student Teaching have worked together to document each placement to ensure that all candidates clearly have at least one clinical experience in a ethnically diverse setting. Prior to the two semesters of fieldwork, the foundations courses specifically require a signature assignment with a diverse student. The Professional Development School at Flory offers a diverse setting for most of the Multiple Subject candidates for their field experience. The partner, soon-to-be a Professional Development School at Los Cerritos offers a similar diverse setting for most of the Single Subject candidates for their field experience. The unit has identified other specific schools in the area that have demographic diversity; often these schools are also Title 1 schools. These identified schools offer the opportunity to work with special needs students. In the Fall of 2008 the unit began tracking clinical placements using the ACCESS Data Base; the profile page includes their placements. If a candidate is not placed in a classroom with adequate diversity, the unit either makes a placement change or finds another way for the candidate to gain the experience, perhaps working with a variety of teachers. Candidates



and supervisors report a high level of satisfaction with the opportunities to work with students who represent ethnic, socio-economic, and special needs diversity. Candidates seemed to appreciate the opportunity to learn about reaching different types and levels of learners and were quite reflective about how they could be even more successful with the various students. At one SS partner school, for example, candidates took the opportunity to visit an EL class and try out a lesson there even though it wasn't a course requirement. Working with EL students is particularly emphasized, and opportunities in this geographic area abound. Other initial programs require a diverse setting for at least one experience.

Feedback from peers and supervisors help candidates reflect on their ability to help all students. The lesson plan format and observation forms always include a section on differentiation. Several specific assignments require more extensive reflection in terms of all student learning, including a reflection on how they might improve the learning. Candidates use their journals as well to reflect on their success. Cooperating teachers frequently commented on how reflective the candidates are and on how prepared they are to work with all students. Candidates interviews revealed the disposition to value and respect all groups of students.

*Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals*

Findings for Advanced and Other School Personnel are similar. All programs require at least one diverse experience. Many of the programs' key outcomes are directly related to working with diverse candidates, particularly in counseling and reading. If the candidate's current workplace does not provide diversity, alternate placements are made in consultation with the Program Director and/or field placement coordinator. Candidates indicated ample opportunity to work with a variety of students. Again, feedback is specific from peers and supervisors regarding the ability to work successfully with all students. A review of various candidate work samples confirmed the work with diverse students successfully.

## **Overall Assessment of the Standard**

Candidates have the opportunity to work with other candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and economic groups on projects and activities. Candidate diversity is maintained by efforts to recruit a variety of candidates. Candidates also have the opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students and are provided feedback to help them reflect on their success with all students.

## **Areas for Improvement and Rationales: None**

- AFI's corrected from last visit –
  1. The unit has no formal documentation system to verify that candidates have field experiences with diverse P-12 students. (ITP) (ADV)  
*Rationale: The unit has implemented a system to track the field experiences of candidates to ensure a diverse placement.*
- AFI's continued from last visit - None

- New AFIs - None

**Recommendation for Standard 4 Initial Teacher Preparation - Met**

**Recommendation for Standard 4 Advanced Preparation - Met**

**State Team Decision: Met**

**Corrections to the Institutional Report: None**

## STANDARD 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

*Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.*

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes      ☐ No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<b>5a. Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>5a. Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation</i></p> <p>California Lutheran University (CLU) offers degrees at the undergraduate, masters and doctoral levels. The full-time and part-time professional education faculty at CLU are well-qualified and credentialed, and a vast majority are experienced K-12 teachers and/or administrators. The faculty integrate and balance current theory with contemporary practical experience which enriches the overall quality of teacher preparation. The evidence documents 22 full-time, tenured or tenure-track professional education faculty with degrees from colleges and universities across the country. Ninety- six percent (96%) of those have an earned doctorate. The remaining four professional education faculty members have a minimum of a master's degree.</p> <p>Four of the twenty-two faculty teaching or working in the Education unit do not have terminal degrees. Two are currently pursuing their doctoral degrees. Two of these individuals are on tenure track. The others are hired as support staff. The unit divides professional education faculty into five categories: professors, associate professors, assistant professors and senior lecturers (Table 11a on page ----of the IR). The unit also employs 66 adjunct faculty members, forty-one of whom are lecturers and twenty-five of whom are supervisors. Each has P-12 teaching experience, an advanced degree, and a valid teaching certificate in the areas he or she teaches or supervises.</p> <p>As indicated by initial and advanced level candidates interviewed, faculty possessing both school experience and a terminal degree are able to provide a rich academic environment where theory, knowledge, and application are combined in a way to benefit and enhance candidate and PreK-12 student learning. These individuals draw upon vast and varied experience as they supervise student teachers and interns and teach specific courses in their specialty areas. The vita shows that faculty members have contemporary school experience by virtue of their work in schools. They collaborate with classroom practitioners to create opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and interact with professional colleagues and students, develop and teach lessons, and</p>			

engage in pre- and post-teaching conferences.

The utilization of community partners possessing years of contemporary school experience in addition to their earned doctoral degrees is a valuable asset to the CLU teacher education and other school personnel programs.

Education faculty who teach in a credential program also supervise candidates in field placements.

<b>5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation*  
Faculty syllabi, instructional methods, grant activities, scholarship, evaluations, and service reflect the unit's conceptual framework and the six elements of STRIVE which comprise the unit goals and outcomes. A review of the course syllabi, individual faculty vitae, and faculty profiles indicates that the faculty have an in-depth understanding of their fields, incorporate the unit's conceptual framework into their coursework and provide for appropriate performance assessments (i.e., signature assignments) throughout the various programs. Faculty, candidates, and school partners know the conceptual framework, its meanings, and can articulate how the conceptual framework is integrated into the Education Department's instruction, service, and scholarship. Assignment rubrics, California Standards and references for further inquiry have also been incorporated into appropriate syllabi. The inclusion of these elements in the syllabi and teaching enable the faculty to determine where their teaching is expected to develop reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions.

The scholarly work among the faculty varies depending on their field of study. Almost all faculty are engaged in one form of scholarly activity or another. Teaching by professional education faculty incorporates current research and theories in their fields of study. Faculty continuously assess individual teaching and its effect on candidates' learning and performances. Faculty teaching in the initial programs teach concepts along with examples of how these concepts could be taught to P-12 students. Candidates are given an opportunity to demonstrate a lesson for their peers. Faculty have several opportunities to engage in self-assessment of their teaching. They use student and peer feedback in order to examine and reflect upon their teaching. Both tenure and promotion require a written reflection of the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching effectiveness. Student evaluations of teaching are also part of the material used for tenure and promotion.

It is evident that faculty integrate diversity and technology in their teaching. The "V" in their STRIVE does show a deep commitment to valuing diversity. Several of their faculty have had experiences with diverse student populations and have published in the area of diversity. Interviews with faculty supported the use of technology as a means of communicating with candidates, and interviews with graduate students indicated the use of technology in instruction. Evidence of this was a 1999 federal PT3 grant to help the School of Education infuse technology into their programs as well as prepare candidates to infuse technology in their classrooms.

<b>5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in</b>		<b>X</b>	
--	--	----------	--

<b>Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>			
<b>5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation</i>  The institution defines itself as a teaching institution. However, in their efforts to enhance academic quality, scholarship has received increased emphasis. Faculty have been involved in different forms of scholarship. For example, since after the CLU last NCATE visit, faculty have published well over 15 peer reviewed articles. This culture of scholarship is now embraced by their candidates who are attending such events as “The Festival of Scholars” under the mentorship of faculty. Candidates are teaming up with faculty in sharing their scholarly work. They also have the opportunity to present the result of their Action Research Project in a Research Colloquium. Finally, the establishment of the doctoral program has added more pressure for faculty and students to produce more scholarly work.</p>			
<b>5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation</i>  Service is considered an integral part of the mission of CLU and the teacher education unit. Review of faculty vitae and Faculty Data Summary Sheets indicate that many faculty are sought as consultants to local, state, and national school districts and agencies (Table----of IR on page----). The unit’s faculty provides service to the university, P-12 schools, professional associations and the broader community through ways that are consistent with their mission. Service is also provided by the faculty through on-campus participation with a variety of committees and activities. Service is also an integral part of a faculty tenure and promotion review process. Faculty are asked to summarize their contributions to their department, school, the university, and the community. Service is a requirement of all full-time faculty at CLU. Faculty are active in local, regional, and national professional association through presentations, active attendance, and leadership through community service.</p> <p>Unit faculty hold memberships in state, national, and international professional organizations. Many faculty members currently hold leadership positions in those organizations.</p>			
<b>5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation</i>  Tenure track faculty are evaluated formally in the second and fourth year pretenure appointment. All departments conduct evaluations annually. Faculty evaluations occur in a variety of forms. One level of evaluation consists of course evaluations completed by candidates. These evaluations are conducted in a manner to maintain complete anonymity for candidates. The results of these course evaluations are required for the annual review of each faculty member by their peers and their departmental chairperson. The Dean and Chairs review the results of student course evaluations and discuss the result with the faculty concerned. Peers also have opportunity as part of an ongoing faculty evaluation process to visit classes being taught by their</p>			

colleagues and provide feedback on teaching effectiveness.

Self-reflection constitutes a second form of faculty evaluation. Each faculty member is required to conduct a self-reflection of teaching and service annually. Each faculty member reports, in a document, all of his or her achievements. The reports are reviewed and evaluated by the department chairperson. The chairperson's evaluation is combined with that of self-reflection and shared with the faculty members in individual conferences.

In these conferences the chairperson makes recommendations for improvements in performance and, if appropriate, counsels faculty about promotion and tenure. At this time, the faculty members may also discuss their professional development plans with the chairperson. Following conferences, written evaluations regarding faculty member's performance by both the dean and the unit chair are forwarded to the vice president for academic affairs' office. Faculty evaluation letters written by the dean and unit chair clearly articulate suggested professional development activities.

Faculty performance is evaluated formally when an individual applies for promotion or tenure. Policies, related to the promotion and tenure of faculty, are provided in California Lutheran University *Faculty Handbook*.

Part-time faculty reviews take place each semester during course evaluation review. Program Directors or full-time faculty members can conduct a classroom visit.

<b>5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	

*Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)*  
The unit professional development is used to identify and celebrate faculty accomplishments as well as to establish goals each year in the areas of teaching scholarship and service. The faculty meets with the Dean annually to review their evaluations, define areas of growth, and develop plans for accomplishing or meeting their goals. Also, Appointment, Rank, and Tenure Committee (ART Committee) recommendations often provide directions for faculty development. Faculty development sessions are planned around the most commonly expressed needs and interests of faculty within the concept of the conceptual framework of the School of Education.

### **Overall Assessment of the Standard**

The faculty of CLU possesses the qualifications and experience required to implement a highly effective teacher preparation program. The cadre of faculty and their experiences are producing a good balance between educational theory and practice. The faculty contributes to scholarly discourse in their fields and collaborates with local school districts on a wide range of projects.

### **Areas for Improvement and Rationales:**

- AFIs corrected from last visit - None
- AFIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIs - None

**Recommendation for Standard 5 Initial Teacher Preparation - Met**

**Recommendation for Standard 5 Advanced Preparation - Met**

**State Team Decision: Met**

**Corrections to the Institutional Report: None**

## STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

*The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X Yes      ☐ No

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<b>6a. Unit Leadership &amp; Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>6a. Unit Leadership &amp; Authority – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<p>The School of Education (SOE) provides the leadership and governance structure for all programs for teacher candidates and other school professionals at California Lutheran University. The Dean of the SOE is responsible for oversight of three departments: Educational Psychology, Teacher Education, and Educational Leadership. Each of these departments is headed by a department chair, and each program within a department is overseen by a program director. Interviews with program directors, department chairs, and the Dean, as well as examination of meeting minutes, indicate a high level of communication and collaboration within the unit leadership. Evidence from documents and interviews shows that there are frequent and regular meetings within and among departments, and between the department chairs and the Dean. These meetings are used for analyzing data related to program improvement and for discussing any issues concerning design and delivery of instruction within programs. This process ensures that there is a high degree of coordination of programs across departments and that the needs of each department are effectively met.</p> <p>Recruiting and admissions processes are clearly described in the CLU Graduate Catalog, in brochures published by the SOE for each educator preparation program, and on the CLU web site. Although 70 – 75 percent of enrollees report hearing about CLU programs by “word of mouth,” the university has an active marketing program to recruit potential enrollees through web optimization, postings on national school web listings, ads in electronic versions of local and regional newspapers, and direct contact with the public at local and regional events.</p> <p>Program and admissions information is also made available through regularly-scheduled information sessions. The schedule for these sessions is posted on the CLU web site. Program information is current and updates are made whenever there are changes in policies, practices, or requirements.</p> <p>Candidates are assigned faculty advisors who meet with them throughout the duration of their programs. Credential candidates are also required to meet with the Credential Analyst during their first semester and again at the end of their programs. In addition to program advisement, a full range of counseling services is available through Student Counseling Services, and health services</p>			



are available through University Health Services

The SOE plays a visible and active role in the P-12 community in Ventura County. Many of the adjunct faculty are current or recently-retired practioners from area schools, and the SOE provides seminars and hosts events which are attended by educators from area schools. Each program involves members of the community in advisory roles, most commonly through participation in advisory committees. The SOE Advisory Committee brings together the program advisory committees twice a year for a collaborative review of programs and to discuss potential program improvements.

The Liberal Studies program (an undergraduate subject matter preparation program for elementary teachers) at CLU has a close working relationship with SOE faculty and takes advantage of relationships that SOE has with area schools to provide early field experience opportunities for aspiring teachers.

		<b>X</b>	
<b>6b. Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation</i>  The annual budget for CLU is set by the Board of Regents. The budget development process begins with the President’s Budget Memorandum, which sets priorities based on the CLU Strategic Plan. Requests from programs are reviewed by the Dean and sent to the Provost, who reviews and prioritizes the requests before sending them to the CLU Budget Committee. This committee, which includes representatives from faculty and institutional leadership, prepares a budget recommendation. The budget recommendation is reviewed by the President’s Cabinet, and a draft budget is presented to the Board of Regents. The Board approves an initial budget in the spring. After an October update based on actual enrollment data, the Board approves the final budget for that academic year.  In the five-year period from 2004-05 to 2008-09, the SOE budget has increased from approximately \$2.8 million to \$3.8. This increase is due in part to enrollment growth in education programs and program expansion. The increase also reflects the unit’s efforts to increase the number of full-time faculty positions in order to decrease reliance on part-time faculty. Budget figures provided by the institution indicate that the SOE receives an equitable share of institutional resources, sufficient to cover the increased cost of SOE programs. In the 2007-08 academic year, for example, the full-time equivalent student (FTES) cost for the SOE was \$5,834, compared to \$4,397 and \$4,693 for the School of Business and the College of Arts and Sciences, respectively. These resources support not only the costs of instructional and clinical faculty, but also professional development and scholarship.			
<b>6c. Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>6c. Personnel – Advanced Preparation</b>		<b>X</b>	
<i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation</i>  The average class size for SOE courses is 12 candidates. During interviews, candidates and program completers uniformly reported that the small class sizes enabled SOE faculty to provide a high level of individual attention and support, and to be very responsive to candidates’ learning needs.  Mean full time faculty teaching loads for spring semester, 2008; fall semester, 2008; and spring			

semester, 2009 are 9.4 units, 9.2 units, and 8.5 units, respectively. In addition to teaching, faculty receive unit credit for a variety of other functions including providing program leadership, fieldwork supervision, grant oversight, and dissertation reading. When unit credit for these activities is included in overall workload for full time faculty, the mean loads are 14.4 units, 14.3 units, and 16.6 units for spring 2008, fall 2008, and spring 2009, respectively. Supervision of clinical practice is performed by adjunct faculty, and loads rarely exceed 10 candidates per full-time equivalent faculty member. In no cases is the load greater than 18.

For 2008-09 academic year, the SOE budgeted \$8,300 for faculty development and nearly \$41,000 for travel. The average amount spent per year for faculty development from 2004 – 2008 is approximately \$5,300 and the average amount for travel is \$47,000. University funds for faculty development include a grant from the Hewlett Packard Foundation, which provides \$1,200 per year for faculty professional development and/or travel. Proposals are reviewed by a university faculty committee and are most often awarded to faculty presenting a paper at a conference. The Provost provides an additional \$1,000 per year for faculty development/travel.

The SOE is very well staffed with support personnel who effectively meet both the administrative needs of faculty and program leadership and the management of candidate records throughout their programs. Candidates and program completers reported that information and assistance are readily available. Library hours and staffing levels are well-tailored to the needs of faculty and students during the week and on weekends. In addition, Information Systems and Services (ISS) is fully staffed to provide rapid response to a wide range of candidate and faculty technology needs.

<b>6d. Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation</b>			<b>X</b>
<b>6d. Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation</b>			<b>X</b>
<p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)</i></p> <p>The SOE is housed in the Spies-Bornemann Center for Education and Technology. The Center was completed in 2002 and includes state-of-the-art computer labs, a television studio for video production and for the campus closed-circuit TV system, and a distance-learning classroom. The distance learning classroom allows students at the main campus to participate in classes taught at either off-campus site in real time. It also allows for videoconferencing with participants anywhere in the world.</p> <p>Full time faculty members have private offices and there are meeting areas throughout the building. In addition, SOE programs make use of the nearly 70 “electronic classrooms” on the Thousand Oaks campus for instruction. Each of these classrooms is outfitted with a computer, LCD projector and VHS/DVD player. Instructional facilities at both the Woodland Hills and Oxnard Centers are comparable to those at the main campus with regard to classroom technology and access to information resources. The 2012 CLU Strategic Plan calls for additional facility investment including a new classroom and faculty office building, advancement of campus technology and infrastructure, and an expansion of library holdings and electronic collections.</p> <p>Pearson Library, on the Thousand Oaks campus, is a modern facility that offers a large number of computer work stations and student study rooms. In addition to a print collection of over 130,000 volumes, the library subscribes to approximately 3,200 e-journals, and provides access to a wide range of educational databases, including e-books.</p>			
<b>6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Initial</b>			

<b>Teacher Preparation</b>			<b>X</b>
<b>6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation</b>			<b>X</b>
<p><i>Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation</i></p> <p>CLU and the SOE have placed a strong emphasis on use of technology to support instructional programs and faculty and staff productivity. SOE computer labs are fully equipped with new Dell and Macintosh computers, which are replaced on a 2 – 3 year cycle. Faculty have equivalent computers, which are replaced on a 3-year cycle. Major software titles are upgraded within one year of release. Faculty needing support with using instructional technology have access to the SOE Center for Teaching and Learning. The Center hosts a weekly lunch seminar for faculty on a wide range of topics and assists faculty with transferring audio and visual media from one form to another (e.g., audiotape to CD, film to DVD) and creating multimedia presentations.</p> <p>While the library continues to budget significant funds for book acquisition and replacement, the primary focus of library budgeting at CLU is “access over acquisition.” As one example of this, a considerable portion of the 2008-09 budget allocated for print periodicals has been shifted to electronic databases and e-books. Candidates have access to information resources not only at the CLU library, but have access library materials from 91 independent academic libraries in Southern California through a statewide consortium. Candidates can request materials through the inter-library loan service at CLU, and interviews with library staff indicate that these materials are delivered quickly. The library also has a curriculum lab with current California state-adopted instructional materials, and an extensive collection of current assessments for use by special education and pupil personnel service credential candidates.</p> <p>In addition to materials, the library provides fax service of scanned materials, online tutorials on a wide range of topics, and direct support to candidates who need help with using technology for completing coursework. Candidates and faculty can make appointments for support during or after working hours. The library and ISS personnel also travel to off-campus centers for 1:1 support for faculty. ISS help desk services are available during library hours Monday – Saturday.</p>			

**Overall Assessment of the Standard:** The School of Education at California Lutheran University benefits from effective leadership and sufficient resources, which enable the institution to provide highly regarded programs. Faculty are uniformly praised by candidates and program completers for the quality of their instruction and the personal attention they provide. While the quality of service faculty provide is very high, their average workloads are significantly higher than NCATE Unit Standards call for. Facilities and resources for supporting the use of technology are exceptionally well developed and set CLU and the SOE apart from many other institutions of CLU’s size.

**Summary of Strengths:** California Lutheran University has been a leader in incorporating technology into all aspects of institutional operation. Candidates in the SOE attend classes in exceptionally well-equipped classrooms, computer labs are up-to-date and software is upgraded regularly, and off-campus facilities are equally well-equipped and maintained. Library services have anticipated the increasing shift from print to electronic media and have moved aggressively

to provide electronic access to a wide range of current e-books, professional journals, web links and portals, and information consortia. In addition, CLU has created a “single sign-on” system that enables students at the university to access all support services, registration and transcript services, and library/media services from *any* Internet access point.

#### **Areas for Improvement and Rationales:**

- AFI's corrected from last visit - None
- AFI's continued from last visit - None
- New AFI's –

6.1 Faculty loads generally exceed 9 hours for graduate teaching.

*Rationale:* Although the average teaching load for full time faculty members ranges from 8.5 to 9.4 units per semester, the units that faculty members receive in lieu of teaching raise the average load to 14.3 to 16.6 units per semester. Workloads of this size have the potential to significantly impact faculty teaching, service, and scholarship if sustained over time, leading to reduced program quality.

**NCATE Team Recommendation: Met**

**State Team Decision: Met**

**Corrections to the Institutional Report: None**

#### **Multiple Subject Credential and Multiple Subject Internship Credential**

##### **Findings on Standards:**

The professional teacher preparation program and its prerequisites include a purposeful, developmentally designed sequence of coursework and field experiences that effectively prepare candidates to teach all K-12 students and understand the contemporary conditions of schooling. By design, coursework and fieldwork comprehensively assist candidates in preparing for an embedded teaching performance assessment.

The Professional Teacher Preparation Program relies on collaborative partnerships both within the University and beyond, including local school districts and the Ventura County Office of Education, in order to provide subject matter preparation for teacher candidates as well as pedagogical preparation and supervised field experiences. By design, the program provides opportunities for candidates to analyze, implement and reflect on relationships between theory and practice related to teaching and learning.

The program provides candidates with instruction to meet the needs of the full range of learners. In each major subject area, candidates study a variety of educational philosophies, human development theories, curriculum development and assessments. Candidates begin to connect ideas and information within and across the major subject areas early in the program and

continue this process through the field work. Candidates learn and use computer-based technology to facilitate the teaching and learning process.

This component gives candidates a strong classroom experience in the semester prior to full-time student teaching, and this is enhanced for candidates who participate in the Partnership School Program with Flory Math/Science Magnet School. Candidates take all methods courses at this school site and are with cooperating teachers four full mornings a week. This partnership can provide a replicable model for field-based teacher preparation. Candidates are prepared to creatively deal with real students in real classrooms and help them succeed.

As each candidate progresses through the program, pedagogical assignments and tasks are increasingly complex and challenging and assessed through academic papers, reflection papers, fieldwork reports, presentations, signature assignments and traditional examinations. In student teaching assignments they are formatively and summatively assessed by supervisors and cooperating teachers on evaluation forms that utilize California Standards for the Teaching Profession and Teaching Performance Expectations as evaluative categories. Pedagogical assignments and tasks are clearly defined; the candidate is appropriately coached and assisted in the satisfactory completion of pedagogical tasks and assignments.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

## Single Subject Credential and Single Subject Internship Credential

### Findings on Standards:

The Single Subject Program at California Lutheran University prepares candidates for the Preliminary Single Subject Credential. The program's mission is embodied in the School of Education's commitment to developing principled, reflective practitioners. The program strives to reach its goal through a balance of course work and fieldwork that integrates theory and practice in meaningful ways for novice teachers.

The program has three phases covered in 36 semester units. In three Foundations Block courses candidates receive instruction in social and cultural foundations of education, theories of teaching and learning, human development, and working with students with diverse learning needs, including English learners and special needs students. In four Methods Block courses candidates learn about legal issues; reading and writing across the secondary curriculum; and planning curriculum, instruction and assessment. They spend three mornings per week in their first student teaching experience. In the Student Teaching Block candidates take an advanced methods course in their subject and student teach full time. Beginning with high-stakes TPA implementation, candidates take TPA Seminar I during the Methods Block, through which they submit TPA Tasks 1 & 2, and TPA Seminar II during the Student Teaching Block, through which they submit Tasks 3 & 4.

The curriculum is tightly integrated to provide candidates with rich preparatory experiences, both of a theoretical and practical nature. Candidates study a variety of educational philosophies, theories of human development, learning theory, curriculum development, assessment measures, and pedagogical strategies. A notable feature of the curriculum is the way courses reiterate themes -- such as working with English learners, students with special needs, and diversity issues -- in new contexts and using different lenses. Candidates learn how to use digital technology across courses, both for administrative and instructional purposes.

One of the many strengths of the program are the early field experiences. Each Foundation Block course has a fieldwork component with structured field-based assignments. Candidates are able to immediately see the connection between theory and practice. The student teaching component of the Methods Block gives candidates a substantive classroom experience during the semester prior to full-time student teaching. This experience is enhanced for the candidates who participate in the Partnership School Program with Los Cerritos Middle School. Candidates take all their Methods Block courses at this school site and are with the cooperating teacher three full mornings per week. The budding partnership with Los Cerritos Middle School promises to provide a strong and replicable model for field-based teacher preparation.

Candidates are assessed throughout program courses through academic papers, reflection papers, fieldwork reports, presentations, signature assignments, and traditional examinations. In both student teaching assignments they are formatively and summatively assessed by supervisors and cooperating teachers on evaluation forms that utilize California Standards for the Teaching Profession and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) as evaluative categories. The TPEs are introduced early in the program, are re-visited in each course, and serve as the basis for performance assessment in student teaching. The program has adopted the California Teaching Performance Assessment to address Program Standards 19-21. Spring 2009 is the initial implementation semester. The program will use TaskStream as the TPA administrative tool.

TaskStream allows for anonymous electronic scoring, and has a data analysis function that will allow the program to look at individual candidate performance as well as aggregate candidate data for program improvement purposes. The program has been revised to include two TPA seminars to coach candidates and supplement instruction in program methods courses.

The Single Subject Program provides candidates with a coherent, systematic, and substantive preparation grounded in current theory, best practices, and state standards. Program faculty are respected and admired by candidates. Candidates are especially appreciative of the care and support faculty provide. They feel they are participating in a strong program that well prepares them to begin their careers.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation, and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

### **Education Specialist Credential and Education Specialist Internship Credential Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Level I and Level II**

#### **Findings on Standards:**

The Education Specialist Credential Program in Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities at California Lutheran University prepares candidates to be reflective, principled educators who will serve as leaders, model teachers, and facilitators of learning and communication. Upon completion of the Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II credential requirements, the candidate is a well qualified teacher.

This program infuses Service-Learning throughout the program which provides opportunities for candidates to enhance their understanding of the connections between academic study, real world activities and the social factors that impact the educational experiences of students across the continuum of diverse communities. In addition the program for both specialization areas begins with foundational courses which are taken with general educators and then provides coursework in general special education. The Level I program concludes with courses specific to either Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe. The Level II program extends these areas of knowledge.

The curriculum of the Level 1 Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe program progresses from basic principles and strategies of assessment, curriculum and instruction to knowledge and skills that are appropriate for individuals with diverse backgrounds, varying language and cognitive abilities and special needs across a variety of environments and activities. The curriculum of the Level II program provides opportunities for in-depth study and examination of the content learned in the Level I program, with additional coursework in research, collaborative consultation, and issues pertaining to their identified area.

The fieldwork experience throughout the Level I program provides candidates with guided practice and support from University supervisors and district support providers. These benchmark experiences vary the responsibilities of the candidate from early observation through

participation, concluding with twelve weeks of full-time teaching with students in their identified area.

Candidate competency is assessed throughout the program. All course assignments have rubrics attached to them. In addition, candidates are evaluated by university supervisors and school site support providers in fieldwork course using open ended feedback forms and competency checklists. A final exit interview is conducted with each candidate.

The faculty at California Lutheran University is highly regarded by peers, graduates, employers, and candidates. The candidates and graduates who were interviewed expressed appreciation for the availability, support, warmth and care provided to them. It was notable how frequently the students mentioned the level of support. Candidates also expressed appreciation for the quality of professional and personal advisement provided across the sites. Students appreciate the small number of students in their classes. Many stated that they chose to enroll in this program because of the benefits they would receive by being in classes with small enrollments.

The school districts are high in their praise of the quality of the special education programs and the graduates. Some stated the applicants from these programs had an advantage over other applicants when applying for a special education teaching position.

Based on candidate, faculty, employer and field supervisor interviews, document review, site visits, and interviews with graduates of the Level I and Level II Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe programs, the team determines that all standards are met.

## **Educational Specialist Credential Program: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Level I and Level II**

### **Findings on Standards:**

California Lutheran University's Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential program is a new program in only its second year of operation. The program strives to prepare teachers who are knowledgeable and skilled to meet the challenges of educating deaf and hard of hearing students.

The program is designed to meet the needs of working professionals in public schools. Courses are offered in the evening, weekends and in the summer. The program uses a cohort model. There is evidence of strong collaboration between the public schools as well as non-profit sites. Candidates are provided with extensive early fieldwork experiences, in a variety of settings.

The program's curriculum is diverse and provides instruction in educating Deaf and Hard of Hearing children birth to 22 years of age. The curriculum includes instruction in language development, assessment, English language development, speech development, hearing science, teaching methodology, and standards based content development. The curriculum provides the teacher candidates with the knowledge and competencies to provide educational services to Deaf and Hard of Hearing students by including current research, providing access to up-to-date technology in the field, providing multiple perspectives on instruction for children who are deaf or hard of hearing, and providing instruction on teaching children with multiple challenges. The



curriculum is taught by qualified faculty and adjunct faculty who are practicing professionals in the field of Deaf Education.

The Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential program provides rich fieldwork opportunities to the teacher candidates. The program infuses early field experience opportunities that include multiple classroom observations, audiology testing and observations, and clinical tutoring. Teacher candidates are required to reflect upon each fieldwork experience. The directed student teaching experience is completed in the public school setting with diverse student populations. The program provides comprehensive support to student teachers, interns, cooperating teachers and support providers by providing weekly classroom visitations, consultations with cooperating teachers, intern support providers and district personnel. Student teachers and interns are provided with comprehensive feedback for each classroom visit. In addition, the Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential program includes cooperating teachers and support providers in trainings and special event programs.

Candidates in the Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential program are assessed throughout the program. Assessments include examinations, case studies, reflections, portfolios, field experience observations and written reports.

Although the program narrative did not accurately reflect the quality of the program (in the areas of Curricular and Instructional Skills in General Education, Characteristics of Learners, Instructional Techniques and Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites), through review of the supporting documentation and conducting interviews of candidates, the program coordinator, adjunct faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

## **Reading Certificate Program**

### **Findings on Standards:**

The Reading Certificate authorizes the holder to assess student reading and provide reading instruction in response to identified areas of need. The program's vision is to prepare reflective, principled education leaders. The Reading Certificate Program prepares candidates to enable K-12 students to become skilled, fluent readers and writers who can communicate in an increasingly technological world.

The CLU Reading Certificate Program four-course sequence is as follows: EDRD 559 (*Curriculum and Research in the Language Arts*), EDRD 563 (*Advanced Diagnosis and Prescription*), EDRD 565 (*Content Area Reading*), and EDSP 532 (*Reading Procedures, Assessment, and Remediation*). Candidates may complete the program via one of three routes: a) as a specialization in the Curriculum and Instruction Master's Degree, b) as part of the Master of Education Teacher Preparation Program Degree, or c) as an avenue for individual professional development.

Candidates are encouraged to work in partner schools or schools in which the program regularly places student teachers or supervises interns. Candidates may choose their settings, but must

document experiences in assessing students, tutoring, and providing small group instruction in both K-3 and 4-8 settings. Candidates work with the Program Coordinator to ensure they complete all assignments and have experiences at the primary and intermediate levels.

Instructors and mentors monitor students through online portfolio entries collected during the semester. The course instructor and mentor complete a rating sheet for each candidate for every course. The Program Coordinator completes a final evaluation for the reading student using these forms and an exit interview. The current candidate competency assessments could be revised to better help the Program Coordinator, instructors, and others determine areas needed for improvement.

Although online reports and evidence such as course descriptions, expectations/outcomes for candidates, descriptions of daily lessons in the syllabi, and samples of student work were insufficient for the accreditation team to fully determine how the program meets CTC Standards, interviews with the Program Coordinator, instructors, candidates, and graduates confirmed program expectations, experiences, and assessments are aligned with state standards. Care is taken by the Reading Certificate Program Coordinator to ensure candidates are learning research-based practices, know how to use formal and informal assessments to determine the instructional needs of diverse student populations in the five key technical reading skills and concepts, and provide instruction and intervention to improve student performance.

Based on candidate, faculty, employer and field supervisor interviews, document review, site visits, and interviews with graduates of the Reading Certificate Program, the team determines all standards are met.

### **Pupil Personnel Services Credential Specializations in School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance**

#### **Findings on Standards:**

The Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program in School Counseling is administered through the Counseling and Guidance Program within the School of Education. The Counseling and Guidance program is one of three graduate programs within the Department of Educational Psychology. Candidates may choose to earn their master's degree in Counseling and Guidance as an extension of the PPS credential. Candidates may also select the School Counseling Internship program option that was approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in 2000. Four full-time field-experienced faculty currently teach in the PPS credential program and there are 12 part-time faculty members who currently teach in the program. The program is offered at the main campus and two centers, Oxnard, and Woodland Hills.

The Counseling and Guidance program consists of 17 courses for a total of 48 credits. A Master of Science degree in Counseling and Guidance may be obtained by passing a comprehensive examination or by writing a thesis. A specific course sequence ensures that students develop a strong understanding of what constitutes effective counseling before entering their fieldwork.

The team found effective coordination among program faculty as evidenced by monthly faculty meetings, twice yearly training opportunities for part-time faculty and district employees, a system where full time faculty serve as course coordinators in order to mentor and serve as a resource for adjunct faculty. Full time faculty also coordinates with schools and district offices to provide training and employment opportunities for program candidates. Planned activities help the university maintain ongoing partnerships that support the candidates. Faculty members are also involved in the K-12 schools through collaborative partnerships funded through several grants. The program maintains currency, quality, and effectiveness throughout key areas of their program.

The specialization in Child Welfare and Attendance includes all existing coursework for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program in School Counseling and requires one additional seminar that focuses specifically on issues related to attendance and school safety. A total of 150 hours in Child Welfare and Attendance is required for completion of this specialization including a minimum of 100 hours working in the area of attendance and school safety. Candidates may obtain the additional 50 hours through embedded assignments in fieldwork courses. The program does a thorough job of preparing counselors to add this authorization.

The curriculum design of the program includes both theory and practice. Candidates participate in small seminars where discussion, role-playing, and case study analysis predominate. Supervised practicum and field studies courses are designed where students apply their knowledge in real life educational settings. There was considerable evidence demonstrating placement of candidates in a variety of school levels and settings. There was evidence of the involvement of at least two supervisors in the assessment of candidates' culminating fieldwork, both formative and summative.

After a review of the institutional report, university catalog, course syllabi, candidate files, fieldwork handbook, information booklet, schedule of classes, advisement documents, faculty vitae, supporting documentation, and interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for both PPS credential specializations: Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance.

## **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential**

### **Findings on Standards:**

The Preliminary Administrative Services credential program at California Lutheran University provides candidates with opportunities to learn, practice, and reflect on the roles and responsibilities of instructional leaders, particularly as they pertain to the improvement of learner outcomes. The program document indicates that the faculty has developed a strong partnership with several local school districts whose employees provide support as field supervisors, advisory committee members, and course instructors.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program is comprised of 24 semester units: 1) seven three-credit courses containing at least 120 hours of practical application and fieldwork embedded within the assignments, 2) two one-credit seminars of portfolio development, and 3) a one-unit portfolio defense. A review of the program syllabi and interviews with faculty and students provided evidence that all Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program courses address the domains for candidate competence and performance and facilitate the development of a professional perspective of educational administration.

Two full-time faculty and four adjuncts teach the required program courses. Candidates gain understanding about both management and leadership practices through study, discussion, and analysis of the work of scholars, researchers, and leaders in the field.

Program candidates participate in field-based experiences that mirror the work of school leaders while applying theory to practice. Each course includes embedded fieldwork aligned to the course content and that meets the standards. Fieldwork occurs in each of the three semesters of program enrollment. Fieldwork is supplemented by two semesters of Leadership Training Center (LTC) experiences at levels other than the candidates' current teaching assignment. In interviews with candidates and program faculty, there was inconsistent communication between the field supervisors and program faculty. Candidates often provided the communication link between the site and the university.

Candidates are assessed through the use of embedded fieldwork and signature assignments aligned with each of the program standards and sub-elements of the standards. Summative assessment occurs through a formal portfolio defense presentation. During the defense, candidates discuss their growth towards each of the CPSELs. This presentation is adjudicated by two full-time faculty and the candidate's site supervisor.

Throughout the visit, candidates, program completers, and employers consistently expressed appreciation for the knowledge, skills, experience, and professionalism of the California Lutheran University faculty and staff; for the personal attention and small class sizes; and for the flexibility and adaptability of the program to meet individual student needs.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of the following: Standard 8, Guidance, Assistance and Feedback, which is Met with Concerns.

**Standard 8b: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback**

While the program sponsor has established a system to guide, assist and evaluate the candidate's performance in each field experience, there is limited evidence that the support and assessment of each candidate is sufficiently coordinated between the candidate's supervising administrator(s), program supervisor(s) and the candidate. A review of the current program document and interviews with candidates and site supervisors provided limited evidence of ongoing collaboration between a representative of the program sponsor and the field/site supervisor.

## **Professional Administrative Services Credential**

### **Findings on Standards:**

At California Lutheran University, the Professional Administrative Services Credential is embedded within the doctorate in Educational Leadership. During its first two years, the program went through several schedule changes as faculty adapted to meet the needs of its professional candidates.

In addition to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs), doctoral curricula and syllabi are built around seven specific program outcomes that candidates are expected to master. These outcomes are based on an integrated philosophy of leadership. These Clear Administrative Services Credential Program outcomes are also aligned with the Doctoral Program outcomes. Throughout the credential program, candidates are encouraged to use their experiences as school leaders to shape their studies as they complete professional learning activities and develop research topics and questions.

The Educational Leadership Student Handbook describes the program admission process which includes a Professional Clear Induction Plan (PCIP), developed and signed in conjunction with candidate, the Coordinator of the Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential Program, and an administrative mentor. The mentor reviews the PCIP progress with the candidates at regular intervals based on the timelines established.

During the development of the PCIP, the administrative mentor (sponsor) signs a written agreement to support and encourage the candidate, spend time with the candidate, and regularly review the candidate's progress in meeting the goals outlined in the PCIP and the standards established in the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. Through interviews with candidates, mentors and program faculty and a review of the student handbook, there was limited evidence as to how the program sponsor and the mentor communicated on a regular basis.

Candidates use a webfolio system to collect their completed assignments. Candidates use the rubrics to rate themselves on specific practice in their leadership work at the school site. Built into the rubrics is the recognition that school administrators must assume multiple roles, including that of instructional leader. The West Ed standards of practice (*Moving Leadership Standards into Everyday Work*) are used by the mentor as a measurement tool of the candidate's leadership competency at the school site. Additionally, a syllabi review revealed that faculty members, who have extensive school/district leadership experience, use specific rubrics to assess

student progress in coursework. As a summative assignment, the candidate defends his/her portfolio, demonstrating growth towards the program outcomes as well as the CPSELs.

Throughout the visit, candidates, graduates and employers repeatedly cited evidence of an exemplary program and faculty. Candidates valued the small classes, personal attention, and flexibility in the CLU program. Candidates and graduates enthusiastically commended both full-time and part-time faculty for their knowledge, skills, experience and commitment to the program and the candidates.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.